REMARKS

Claims 1-20 and 23-33 are pending in this application. Applicant notes that claims 21 and 22 were cancelled in the response filed March 26, 2001, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

The Advisory Action dated January 30, 2002 indicates that the amendment to the paragraph at page 58, line 25 to page 59, line 20 does not appear to be supported by the specification as originally filed. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant submits that the changes are obvious in view of the fact that the SEQ ID NOS for each oligonucleotide referenced in this paragraph were correct as originally filed. The SEQ ID NOS have not changed and the sequences to which they refer have not changed. Applicant is merely correcting the description of the SEQ ID NOS, which were incorrect. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by this amendment. Applicant therefore respectfully requests entry of this amendment.

This paragraph has been further amended herein to correct typographical punctuation errors. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by these additional amendments. As the previous amendment to this paragraph has not yet been entered, changes are shown relative to the original version of this paragraph.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the amendment and arguments set forth above as well as the amendments and arguments made in the Amendment filed October 17, 2001 and the Declaration filed therewith, which are asked to be entered and considered with the filing of this Continued Prosecution Application, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections contained in the Office Action mailed on June 20, 2001, and the Advisory Action mailed on January 30, 2002, have been overcome, and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

In view of the Notice of Appeal filed December 17, 2001, Applicant encloses a Petition for a One Month Extension of Time pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, until March 18, 2002 (March 17, 2002 being a Sunday), to respond to the Examiner's Advisory Action mailed on January 30, 2002. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-0219 the $55.00 fee for this purpose.

Applicant is filing herewith a request for a Continued Prosecution Application in this case.

Applicant also encloses herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement, for which authorization to charge our Deposit Accout No. 08-0219 the $180.00 fee has been given.

No other fees are believed to be due in connection with this response. However, please charge any underpayments or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

If the Examiner believes that any further discussion of this communication would be helpful, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann-Louise Kerner, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 33,523

March 18, 2002

HALE AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Tel: (617) 526-6000
Fax: (617) 526-5000

Attachment: Marked Up Version of Replacement Paragraph in Specification

Marked Up Version of Replacement Paragraph in Specification Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(b)(1)(iii) Compared to Original Version

Paragraph at page 58, line 25 to page 59, line 20:

LS-174T human colon carcinoma cells (1×10^6 cells) were inoculated subcutaneously (s.c.) into the left flank of athymic mice. A single dose of RI_α antisense hybrid (Oligo ~~164~~ **165**, SEQ ID NO:4), inverted hybrid (Oligo 166, SEQ ID NO:6), or ~~inverted chimeric~~ **antisense** (Oligo ~~190~~ **164**, SEQ ID NO:1) oligonucleotides or control oligonucleotide (Oligo 169, (SEQ ID NO:7); Oligo 168 (SEQ ID NO:5); Oligo 188, (SEQ ID NO:3)) as shown in Table 1 (1 mg per 0.1 ml saline per mouse), or saline (0.1 ml per mouse), was injected s.c. into the right flank of mice when tumor size reached 80 to 100 mg, about 1 week after cell inoculation. Tumor volumes were obtained from daily measurement of the longest and shortest diameters and calculation by the formula, $4/3\pi r^3$ where r = (length + width)/4. At each indicated time, two animals from the control and antisense-treated groups were killed, and tumors were removed and weighed. The results are shown in FIG. 1. These results show that the size of the tumor in the animal treated with the inverted hybrid oligonucleotide 166 having SEQ ID NO:6 was surprisingly smaller from three days after injection onward than the phosphorothioate oligonucleotide 164 having SEQ ID NO:1. That this effect was sequence-specific is also demonstrated in FIG. 1: control oligonucleotide 168 (SEQ ID NO:~~3~~ **5**) has little ability to keep tumor size at a minimum relative to the hybrid and inverted hybrid oligonucleotides.